

MARIAN UNIVERSITY

Indianapolis

Academy for Teaching and Learning Leadership

School Evaluation

Andrew Academy

Prepared For: Office of Education Innovation, Office of Mayor
Gregory A. Ballard, City of Indianapolis

Site Visit Dates: October 30, 2013

Principal: Dr. Carlotta Coopriider

Evaluators: Cynthia Farren
Sr. Jeanne Hagelskamp
Dr. Jeffery Kauffman
James Larson
Dr. Charlotte Westerhaus

DRAFT

Table of Contents

Part I: School Evaluation Overview and Methodology	3
Part II: Andrew Academy Background Information	5
Part III: Core Question Four Indicator Ratings	7
Part IV: Findings ¹	8
<i>Indicator 4.1: Curriculum and Supporting Materials</i>	8
<i>Indicator 4.2: Pedagogy</i>	12
<i>Indicator 4.4: Assessment</i>	15
<i>Indicator 4.5: Talent</i>	17
<i>Indicator 4.6: Mission</i>	20
<i>Indicator 4.7: Climate</i>	21
<i>Indicator 4.8: Communication</i>	23
<i>Indicator 4.9: Special Education</i>	25
<i>Indicator 4.10: English as a New Language</i>	27
Part V: Recommendations	29

¹ Because Andrew Academy does not serve high school students, Indicator 4.3 (i.e., supporting students for post-secondary options) is not addressed in this report.

Part I: School Evaluation Overview and Methodology

Andrew Academy (“Andrew”) is a public charter school sponsored by the Indianapolis Mayor’s Office of Education Innovation (“OEI”). Andrew is in the fourth academic year of its first charter term with OEI. During the fourth academic year of the first charter term, OEI requires its sponsored schools to undergo a comprehensive review guided by a performance framework. The OEI performance framework includes four core questions:

1. Is the educational program a success?
2. Is the organization in sound fiscal health?
3. Is the organization effective and well-run?
4. Is the school providing the appropriate conditions for success?

The school evaluation described herein addresses OEI’s fourth core question. This report includes:

1. An explanation of the school evaluation process
2. An overview of Andrew Academy’s demographic and academic performance data
3. Findings from the school evaluation
4. Recommendations for school improvement

Process

The school evaluation process involved three phases – document review, site visit, and survey analysis. Prior to the site visit, the evaluation team (“team”) reviewed Andrew’s mission statement, school improvement plan, and school discipline policy. This review

informed the questions asked during site visit focus groups and one-on-one interviews.

After the site visit, staff responses to survey questions aligned to core question four were analyzed. The survey results provided an important additional data point, confirming most of the findings from the site visit. The site visit consisted of the following components:

- Document analysis (e.g., scopes and sequences, pacing guides, lesson plans)
- Classroom and shared space observations
- Focus groups
 - Teachers that serve students in kindergarten through eighth grade
 - Students from third through eighth grade
 - Family members
- Interviews
 - Principal
 - Archdiocese of Indianapolis Charter Schools Curriculum Director
 - Dean / data analyst
 - Special Education teacher
 - English as a New Language (“ENL”) teacher
- Review of files and supports for Special Education students

- Review of files and supports for ENL students

DRAFT

Part II: Andrew Academy Background Information

Andrew Academy is a part of the ADI Charter Schools, Inc. network (“ADI”). The Archdiocese of Indianapolis created this network of two schools, both serving grades kindergarten through eight, in 2010. The mission of both schools is to “educate students to become self-sufficient and productive leaders who are ready to succeed in a diverse global society.”

Student Demographics

As reported on the Indiana Department of Education’s “Compass” data center, Andrew Academy enrolled 217 students for the 2012-2013 academic year.² 83% of students are eligible to receive free or reduced price meals. The ethnic breakdown of the student population is as follows: Black (92.2%), Hispanic (3.7%), Multiracial (3.2%), and White (0.9%). 8.8% of students take part in the school’s Special Education program, while less than one percent of students participate in the school’s English as a New Language program.

Student Performance

The charts below describe Padua’s results on state assessments and the state’s school accountability model.

² Indiana Department of Education. (2013, Fall). Enrollment Overview. *IDOE: Compass*. Retrieved November 20, 2013, from <http://compass.doe.in.gov/dashboard/enrollment.aspx?type=school&id=5785>.

IREAD-3 Results ³	Percent Passing – Padua	Percent Passing - Indiana
2011-2012	65.2%	85.5%
2012-2013	100%	91.7%

ISTEP+ Results ⁴	Percent Passing Both E/LA & Math	Percent Passing E/LA	Percent Passing Math
2010-2011	49.4%	68.5%	52.2%
2011-2012	33.6%	61.3%	44.8%
2012-2013	53.4%	70.9%	63.3%

ISTEP+ Results	Percent Passing Both E/LA & Math		Percent Passing E/LA		Percent Passing Math	
2010-2011	3 rd	38.1%	3 rd	85.7%	3 rd	38.1%
	4 th	50.0%	4 th	65.0%	4 th	50.0%
	5 th	66.7%	5 th	66.7%	5 th	72.2%
	6 th	50.0%	6 th	64.3%	6 th	60.0%
	7 th	43.8%	7 th	56.3%	7 th	43.8%
2011-2012	3 rd	26.1%	3 rd	73.9%	3 rd	30.4%
	4 th	42.1%	4 th	68.4%	4 th	42.1%
	5 th	23.8%	5 th	52.4%	5 th	38.1%
	6 th	64.3%	6 th	76.5%	6 th	64.3%
	7 th	27.8%	7 th	55.6%	7 th	44.4%
	8 th	28.6%	8 th	42.9%	8 th	57.1
2012-2013	3 rd	68.4%	3 rd	89.5%	3 rd	68.4%

³ Indiana Department of Education. (2013, Fall). IREAD-3 Results Overview. *IDOE: Compass*. Retrieved November 20, 2013, from <http://compass.doe.in.gov/dashboard/iread3acc.aspx?type=school&id=5785>.

⁴ Indiana Department of Education. (2013, Fall). IREAD+ Overview. *IDOE: Compass*. Retrieved November 20, 2013, from <http://compass.doe.in.gov/dashboard/istep.aspx?type=school&id=5785>.

	4 th	36.4%	4 th	59.1%	4 th	50.0%
	5 th	42.1%	5 th	57.9%	5 th	65.0%
	6 th	37.5%	6 th	68.8%	6 th	43.8%
	7 th	77.8%	7 th	77.8%	7 th	83.3%
	8 th	59.1%	8 th	73.9%	8 th	68.2%

State School Accountability Designation	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Letter Grade	D	C	C

Part III: Core Question 4 Indicator Ratings

The fourth core question of the OEI's performance framework consists of ten indicators⁵ and three possible ratings. The chart below is aligned to these indicators and ratings.

Does not meet standard	School exhibits significant concerns in two or more elements of the indicator
Approaching standard	School exhibits significant concerns in one element of the indicator
Meets standard	School does not exhibit significant concerns in any elements of the indicator

Core Question 4 Indicator	Rating
4.1: Curriculum and Supporting Materials	Approaching standard
4.2: Pedagogy	Approaching standard
4.4: Assessment	Approaching standard

⁵ Because Andrew Academy does not serve high school students, Indicator 4.3 (i.e., supporting students for post-secondary options) is not addressed in this report.

4.5: Talent	Does not meet standard
4.6: Mission	Meets standard
4.7: Climate	Approaching standard
4.8: Communication	Meets standard
4.9: Special Education	Does not meet standard
4.10: English as a New Language	Does not meet standard

Part IV: Findings

Indicator 4.1: Curriculum and Supporting Materials	Approaching standard
---	-----------------------------

Element	Evaluation
a) <i>Does the curriculum align with state standards?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The school leader requires teachers to submit lesson plans weekly that specify the Indiana Academic Standard(s) focused on in each lesson. The curriculum maps provided by ADI and pacing guides from Acuity are also tied to Indiana Academic Standards. 	

Element	Evaluation
b) <i>Does the school conduct systematic reviews of its curriculum to identify gaps based on student performance?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No

Findings

- One teacher from each grade level at Andrew serves on ADI's curriculum development and review team. Over the past two years, these teachers, working with colleagues from other ADI schools, conducted a thorough curriculum review and then created English/Language Arts and Math scopes tied to both Indiana Academic Standards and Common Core State Standards as well as related end-of-year assessments.
- ADI plans to continue to work with this group of teachers to develop quarterly pacing guides for each subject and grade level.

Element	Evaluation
c) Does the school regularly review its scopes and sequences to ensure presentation of content in time for testing?	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently, teachers in kindergarten through second grade are the only ones using the brand new scopes described above. Until the state of Indiana decides which new standards to adopt or create, teachers in grades three through eight are not yet using these ADI-developed scopes because they are aligned to both Indiana Academic Standards and Common Core State Standards. Consequently, while the school leader and ADI curriculum director both expressed a desire to annually review these newly developed scopes, this process is in the queue until new standards are 	

decided upon.

- In the meantime, English/Language Arts and math teachers in grades three through eight are utilizing Acuity pacing guides for the English/Language Arts and Math in order to ensure core academic standards are taught prior to state assessments. These assessments are structured to be predictive of a student's ISTEP+ performance. Thus, following these pacing guides helps ensure students are taught core academic standards before the state tests. Because McGraw-Hill CTB, the company that produces Acuity, conducts its own annual review to ensure the assessments and pacing guides are aligned to the ISTEP+ assessments, ADI does not need to conduct its own annual review of these pacing guides.

Element	Evaluation
<i>d) Does the school have a sequence of topics across grade levels and content areas that focuses on core (prioritized) learning objectives?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For English/Language Arts and Math in kindergarten through second grade, teachers follow sequences embedded in their textbooks as well as detailed curriculum maps created by teachers across the ADI network. 	

- For English/Language Arts and Math in third through eighth grade, teachers utilize pacing guides for the Acuity formative assessments, aligned to Indiana Academic Standards.

Element	Evaluation
e) Does the staff understand and uniformly use curriculum documents and related program materials to effectively deliver instruction?	Yes / <u>No</u>
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The school leader requires all staff to submit weekly lesson plans. Most teachers in grades three through eight model their lesson plans off of the TAP⁶ rubric, but there is a great deal of variation in lesson plan formats and content. Some lesson plans are missing objectives and activities, other are missing plans for differentiation and checks for understanding. The school leader's goal is to utilize the support of Andrew's TAP master teacher to ensure all teachers are consistently using a TAP-centric lesson plan template, with certain components customized to each grade level's specific needs (e.g., IREAD-3 at third grade). 	

Element	Evaluation
f) Does the staff have programs and materials to effectively deliver the curriculum?	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	

⁶ TAP stands for The System for Teacher and Student Achievement. Andrew Academy uses TAP to structure its professional learning communities and teacher evaluation system.

- 92% of respondents to the staff survey reported having the programs and materials needed to effectively deliver their curriculum.
- 71% of those respondents described these programs and materials as high quality.
- During the staff focus group and through the survey, teachers identified a few specific areas where additional resources would be helpful (e.g., wireless internet and additional technology in classrooms, easier access to science resources within the building).

DRAFT

Indicator 4.2: Pedagogy		Approaching standard
Element		Evaluation
<i>a) Is the curriculum implemented in the majority of classrooms according to its design?</i>		<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While the curriculum varies in content from classroom to classroom, there are a few core components that the evaluation team, based on what the school leader asks teachers to include in their lesson plans, expected to observe in every classroom – objective and standard posted on the board, activities tied to the objective and standard, varied instructional techniques, differentiation, and checks for understanding. Overall, the team observed the majority of these components in 77% of classrooms. 		
Element		Evaluation
<i>b) Does the pace of instruction/lessons and content delivery possess the appropriate rigor and challenge?</i>		<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence collected during the student focus group indicates that while some students would like to be challenged more in their classes, they are satisfied overall with the rigor and pace of their lessons. In 70% of classrooms, evaluators observed lessons delivered at an appropriate or high level of rigor. In 62% of classrooms, evaluators observed lessons with a coherent flow, taught at an appropriate pace. Ultimately, while pace and rigor were not appropriate in certain classrooms, a solid 		

majority of teachers are effectively utilizing these pedagogical tools to engage their students in lessons.

Element	Evaluation
c) <i>Is instruction, as delivered, focused on core learning objectives?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 81% of classrooms, instruction as delivered was explicitly tied to a core learning objective(s), written out on the board, often in the form of an “I Can” statement. In two classrooms, teachers had students read these “I Can” statements aloud to their peers at the beginning of class and frequently referred back to the statements to reinforce the goal of the lesson. 	

Element	Evaluation
d) <i>Do instructional activities possess variety and/or use of differentiated strategies to engage a wide range of student interests, abilities, and learning needs?</i>	Yes / <u>No</u>
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 54% of classrooms, instructional strategies were singular in nature and/or discussion techniques were mostly on the first level of Bloom’s taxonomy (e.g., Do you remember what we talked about yesterday?). Feedback collected during the student focus group supports the previous finding. Students, particularly middle school students, expressed a desire for fewer worksheets and more project-based learning. 	

Element	Evaluation
e) Does the school supply sufficient feedback to staff on instructional practices?	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100% of survey respondents noted that the feedback they receive through TAP⁷ is timely and helps to improve their instruction. During the teacher focus group, elective course teachers mentioned that even though they are not officially apart of TAP (due to their roles at multiple schools), the school leader still observes their classrooms and holds debriefing meetings, which they appreciate. 	

⁷ TAP stands for The System for Teacher and Student Achievement. Andrew uses TAP to structure its professional learning communities and teacher evaluation system.

Indicator 4.4: Assessment		Approaching standard
Element		Evaluation
a) Are the standardized and/or classroom assessments accurate and useful measures of established learning standards/objectives?		<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">95% of respondents to the staff survey reported that Andrew’s formative assessments (e.g., Dibels, Star Math, Acuity) are aligned to their classes’ scopes and sequences.Andrew Academy utilizes formative assessments designed to be predictive of a student’s performance on the state exam (i.e., Acuity) or to monitor progress towards the development of core literacy skills (i.e., Dibels) and math skills (i.e., Star Math).Additionally, for kindergarten through second grade, ADI has developed end-of-year assessments tied to the scopes and sequences for English/Language Arts and math.		

Element		Evaluation
b) Does the school distribute assessment results to classroom teachers in a timely and useful manner to influence instructional decisions?		<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">95% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement: “I receive my students’ data from my school’s formative assessments in a timely manner.”80% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement: “The way I receive my students’ data from my school’s formative assessments makes it easy to		

determine how I need to modify my instruction.” Thus the protocol for delivering student data from formative assessments needs to be enhanced to ensure teachers quickly modify their instruction to meet students’ demonstrated learning needs.

Element	Evaluation
c) Does the school select assessments that have sufficient variety to guide instruction for a wide range of student learning abilities?	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Andrew Academy uses formative assessments with multiple question types (e.g., multiple choice, short answer) that are assessed through multiple modalities (e.g., written, verbal) to provide teachers with a clear understanding of how students perform on a range of questions. 	

Element	Evaluation
d) Does the school use assessments with sufficient frequency to inform instructional decisions effectively?	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Andrew Academy’s formative assessments are consolidated to two for kindergarten through second grade (i.e., Dibels and Star Math) and one for grades three through eight (i.e., Acuity). All of these assessments occur three times a year – pre, mid, and end-of-year. Together, these formative assessments ensure each English/Language Arts and math teacher has within-year mechanisms to monitor each student’s progress towards mastery of core learning objectives. 	

Element	Evaluation
e) Does the school use assessment results to guide instruction or make adjustments to curriculum?	Yes / <u>No</u>

Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A third of staff members report <i>not</i> having the training and support necessary to modify their instruction and/or curriculum based on assessment results. Evidence collected from the staff survey indicates that those teachers who make such adjustments do so with their own systems and supports.

Indicator 4.5: Talent	Does not meet standard
-----------------------	------------------------

Element	Evaluation
a) Are the school's hiring processes organized and used to support the success of new staff members?	Yes / <u>No</u>

Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The school does not have a clear and detailed hiring protocol and timeline. Interview guides and rubrics do not exist. The school does not have a staff induction program. The school has the beginnings of a staff mentoring program. The school leader created three learning communities (i.e., kindergarten through second grade, third through fifth grade, and sixth through eighth grade) and designated one teacher within each community as the anchor teacher. During the site visit, the roles and responsibilities for the anchor were being formalized. When asked to rank eight school features on a scale of one to eight, with one being the school's greatest strength and eight being the school's most urgent area for improvement, Andrew staff strongly ranked staff induction and mentoring as the school's greatest area for growth.

Element	Evaluation
b) Does the school deploy sufficient number of faculty and staff to	<u>Yes</u> / No

<i>maximize instructional time and capacity?</i>	
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While the school currently has a sufficient number of staff, Andrew experienced significant turnover this school years As such, numerous staff are new to the building and some have been hired to replace individuals within this academic year. At the time of the site visit, the school leader hoped to move a student teacher into a middle school social studies and science role once he completed his student teaching experience. In sum, the staffing is sufficient, but tenuous. 	

Element	Evaluation
<i>c) Are faculty and staff certified/trained in areas to which they are assigned?</i>	Yes / <u>No</u>
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the time of the site visit, the following positions were not staffed with teachers who have the appropriate license for their content area and/or grade level: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Middle school English/Language Arts Middle school math Once the student teachers finishes his program and is moved to middle school social studies and science, this position will also not be staffed by someone with the appropriate licenses The school leader reported that these teachers will soon take the appropriate Praxis tests to obtain the relevant licenses. The Assistant Principal recently took the principal's test and as such, did not have the appropriate license for his role at the time of the site visit. The special education teacher has a life license and is in the process of obtaining an emergency permit for this area. 	

Element	Evaluation
<i>d) Is professional development related to demonstrated needs for instructional improvement?</i>	Yes / <u>No</u>
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ADI requires teachers in its network of schools to participate in six days of professional development during the school year. • Along with other ADI schools, Andrew staff were required to participate in two days of technology professional development before the start of the school year. Given the absence of wireless connectivity at Andrew Academy, the vast majority of this training was not relevant nor was it tied to the school's demonstrated needs for instructional improvement. • The content for the remaining four days of professional development with ADI will be the same for all network schools. • In an effort to provide targeted professional development to Andrew's staff, the school leader has coordinated five Wednesday evening sessions focused on special education best practices and the school's new literacy curriculum for kindergarten through fifth grade. The school leader plans to continue to offer these sessions based on the school's demonstrated needs. 	

Element	Evaluation
<i>e) Are professional development opportunities determined through analyses of student attainment and improvement?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During weekly TAP cluster meetings, the TAP master teacher provides professional development informed by student data analysis, classroom observations, and the TAP rubric. 	

Element	Evaluation
<i>f) Does the school explicitly and regularly implement its teacher evaluation plan with a clear process and criteria?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher evaluation was ranked as the school's greatest strength on the staff survey. 100% of survey respondents reported that Andrew's teacher evaluation process is clear and implemented consistently. 	

Indicator 4.6: Mission		Meets standard
Element		Evaluation
a) Does the school have a mission that is shared by all stakeholders?		Yes / No
Findings		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Early in the fall, the school leader took Andrew’s staff through the process of writing its own mission statement. Perhaps unsurprisingly then, 100% of staff report having a clear understanding of and deep commitment to the school’s mission statement.The evaluation team did not unearth any evidence that suggest stakeholders are not bought in to the new mission statement. However, given its recent update, staff must be sure to share the mission and its significance with other stakeholder groups.		
Element		Evaluation
b) Do stakeholders possess widespread knowledge and commitment to the intentions of the school’s mission?		<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Based on findings from the staff survey, teachers are clearly knowledgeable and committed to the intentions of the school’s mission.The school leader and a few survey respondents acknowledge, however, that the next important steps are to share the new mission statement with students as well as family and community members in a manner that builds their knowledge of and commitment to the mission to a similar level. Feedback from the family member and student focus groups highlight that, even though these stakeholder groups might not be able to recite the school’s mission statement, they feel an immense sense of		

optimism and hope towards the “new” Andrew Academy.

DRAFT

Indicator 4.7: Climate	Approaching standard
------------------------	----------------------

Element	Evaluation
a) Does the school have clearly stated rules that enforce positive behavior?	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The school's discipline policy has clear rules that set a high bar for positive student behavior. School rules are also posted in all classrooms. 	

Element	Evaluation
b) Does the school's discipline approach possess high expectations for student behavior?	Yes / <u>No</u>
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Through the staff survey, school culture was identified as the second most urgent area for school improvement. Family members and students raised additional concerns about student behavior during their focus groups, but also noted that student behavior has improved this year. Finally, the enforcement of school rules and setting of high expectations for behavior were, on average, the two lowest rated areas during classroom observations. 	

Element	Evaluation
<i>c) Are interactions between faculty and students respectful and supportive? Are faculty and students clear about processes for conflict resolution?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 95% of survey respondents agreed or strongly agreed that interactions between faculty and students are respectful and supportive. 90% of survey respondents believe Andrew Academy has a clear process for resolving conflicts between staff and students. 	

Element	Evaluation
<i>d) Are interactions between faculty and administration professional and constructive?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 92% of survey respondents agreed or strongly agreed that interactions between staff and school administrators are professional and constructive. During their focus group, teachers expressed excitement about the supportive staff culture. 	

Indicator 4.8: Communication	Meets standard
-------------------------------------	-----------------------

Element	Evaluation
<i>a) Does the school have active and ongoing communication with parents?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The school leader met with every family in July 2013. The school has hosted a back to school night and multiple family nights. Teachers sent home weekly newsletters to family members. 	

Element	Evaluation
<i>b) Does the school utilize communications that are both timely and relevant to parental concerns?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The school leader has facilitated multiple family member forums to address their questions and concerns. For example, at the first family member forum, the school's dismissal procedures were discussed and subsequently improved. During the family member focus group, participants expressed their appreciation for the school leader's accessibility, responsiveness, and leadership. 	

Element	Evaluation
<i>c) Does the school communicate student academic progress and achievement in reports that are understood by parents?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The October family night event focused on preparing family members for teacher conferences. The event introduced family members to their child's academic data. 	

- Andrew Academy provides family members with eight student academic progress reports a year – four progress reports and four report cards.

Element	Evaluation
<i>d) Are the school's communication methods designed to meet the needs of a diverse set of parents⁸?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The school's existing communication methods are extensive (e.g., formal parent nights, phone calls home, informal conversations during dismissal) and diverse in terms of their delivery method (e.g., email, text, phone, letters home). 	

⁸ The quality of the school's communication with the family members of its ENL students will be addressed in Indicator 10.

Indicator 4.9: Special Education		Does not meet standard
Element		Evaluation
a) Do services outlined within Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) adequately match the exceptional needs of the student?		<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">70% of IEPs reviewed⁹ appropriately described services that align with the student’s exceptional needs.		
Element		Evaluation
b) Do each of the needs identified within the IEPs have a corresponding goal and plan for assessment?		<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Nearly three-fourths of IEPs reviewed described goals for each identified need and a plan to progress monitoring each goal.		
Element		Evaluation
c) Are the goals outlined in IEPs rigorous and based on state and national learning standards?		Yes / <u>No</u>
Findings		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">After analyzing the IEPs available, two concerning trends emerged.The vast majority of IEP goals are not data-driven (e.g., informed by the student’s performance on local or state assessments).The behavior goals and strategies described are almost universally negative.		

⁹ The evaluator reviewed a total of 15 IEPs.

Element	Evaluation
<i>d) Does explicit evidence exist to demonstrate that goals have evolved each year as the student develops?</i>	Yes / <u>No</u>
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nearly half of IEPs reviewed showed no evidence that goals have evolved yearly as the student develops. Another 20% of IEPs reviewed showed only some evidence that goals have evolved yearly as the student develops. 	

Element	Evaluation
<i>e) Is a specifically designed curriculum outlined in each IEP?</i>	Yes / <u>No</u>
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two-thirds of IEPs reviewed did not have a curriculum outlined in the IEP. 	

Indicator 4.10: English as a New Language	Does not meet standard
--	-------------------------------

Element	Evaluation
<i>a) Do the appropriate staff have a clear understanding of current legislation, research and effective practices relating to the provision of ENL services?</i>	<u>Yes</u> / No
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The teacher responsible for Andrew's ENL program has the necessary knowledge regarding ENL services, legislation, and best practices. 	

Element	Evaluation
<i>b) Are relationships with students, parents, and external providers well-managed and comply with law and regulation?</i>	Yes / <u>No</u>
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Andrew Academy has a small number of ENL students, but no one on staff is fluent in Spanish. During the site visit, staff noted the need to develop a solution to this communication barrier. 	

Element	Evaluation
<i>c) Is the school fulfilling its legal obligations regarding ENL students?</i>	Yes / <u>No</u>
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The school has home language surveys on file for every student. At the time of the site visit, each ENL students had not yet taken their placement exam. While numerous supports were described (e.g., bi-weekly progress assessments), all 	

of them were in development at the time of the site visit.

Element	Evaluation
<i>d) Do Individual Learning Plans ("ILPs") contain all required information and incorporate best practices, such as measurable learning goals?</i>	Yes / <u>No</u>
Findings	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ILPs do not yet exist and as such, instructional supports informed by assessment results also do not exist. 	

Part V: Recommendations

The review team's recommendations are tiered into urgent and high priorities as well as aligned to OEI's Core Question 4 indicators.

Indicator 4.1: Curriculum and Supporting Materials	Approaching standard
High Priorities	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop and implement a lesson plan template to ensure all staff are preparing for and delivering effective instruction. 	
Indicator 4.2: Pedagogy	Approaching standard
High Priorities	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilize TAP cluster meetings and classroom observations to build teachers' capacity to use a variety of instructional strategies and questioning techniques that engage a wide range of student learning needs. 	
Indicator 4.4: Assessment	Approaching standard
High Priorities	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure all staff members receive the training and supports necessary to modify their instruction and/or curriculum based on assessment results. School-wide systems and supports are needed for making data-driven instructional decisions. 	

Indicator 4.5: Talent	Does not meet standard
Urgent Priorities	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given that close to half of the staff, along with the school leader, are new to Andrew this year, it is especially important to formalize staff induction and mentoring programs as soon as possible. Ensure all staff are certified in the content areas and grade levels that they teach. Continue to provide professional development related to the school's demonstrated needs for instructional improvement (e.g., varied instructional strategies and questioning techniques). 	
High Priorities	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop a clear and detailed hiring protocol and timeline. 	
Indicator 4.6: Mission	Meets standard
High Priorities	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Build students' as well as family and community members' knowledge and investment in Andrew Academy's mission and desired outcomes. 	
Indicator 4.7: Climate	Approaching standard
Urgent Priorities	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback from the student and teacher focus groups as well as some site visit observations highlight that school rules are not being consistently implemented. School-wide expectations need to be reinforced to staff and students, and then 	

followed through on consistently to ensure classrooms are places of learning.

Indicator 4.8: Communications	Meets standard
High Priorities	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the school's long-standing presence in the community, Andrew Academy should continue to develop community partnerships and offer events targeted to family members other than parents (e.g., grandparents). 	
Indicator 4.9: Special Education	Does not meet standard
Urgent Priorities	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IEP goals must be data-driven. Behavior goals and strategies should be positively framed. IEP goals should evolve yearly as the student develops. Each IEP should have a specialized curriculum tied to each student's needs and goals. 	
Indicator 4.10: English as a New Language	Does not meet standard
Urgent Priorities	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quickly develop a reliable and effective manner to verbally communicate with the family members of ENL students. Administer the placement exam to ENL students. 	

- Based on results of the placement exam, develop ILPs that clearly outline supports aligned to the student's demonstrated needs and goals.

DRAFT